arXiv:1603.05122v2 [math.OA] 20 Aug 2016

A tuple of multiplication operators defined by twisted holomorphic proper maps

Pan Ma Hansong Huang

Abstract: This paper mainly concerns the von Neumann algebras induced by a tuple of multiplication operators on Bergman spaces which arise essentially from holomorphic proper maps over higher dimensional domains. We study the structures and abelian properties of the related von Neumann algebras, and in interesting cases they turns out to be tightly related to a Riemann manifold. There is a close interplay between operator theory, geometry and complex analysis. Many examples are presented.

Keywords: von Neumann algebra; holomorphic proper map; local solution

2000 AMS Subject Classification: 47A13; 32H35.

1 Introduction

In this paper, $\mathbb{D}$ denotes the unit disk in the complex plane $\mathbb{C}$. Let Ω denote a bounded domain in the complex space $\mathbb{C}^d$, and dA be the Lebesgue measure on Ω. The Bergman space $L^2_a(\Omega)$ is the Hilbert space consisting of all holomorphic functions over Ω which are square integrable with respect to the Lebesgue measure dA. For a holomorphic map $F : \Omega \to \mathbb{C}^d$, denote by JF the determinant of the Jacobian of F.

For a bounded holomorphic function ϕ over Ω, let $M_{\phi,\Omega}$ denote the multiplication operator with the symbol ϕ on $L^2_a(\Omega)$, given by

$$M_{\phi,\Omega} f = \phi f,\ f \in L^2_a(\Omega).$$

In general, for a tuple $\Phi = \{\phi_j : 1 \leq j \leq n\}$, let $\{M_{\Phi,\Omega}\}'$ denote the commutant of $\{M_{\phi_j} : 1 \leq j \leq n\}$, consisting of all bounded operators commuting with each operator $M_{\phi_j,\Omega}(1 \leq j \leq n)$. Here, we emphasize that $M_{\Phi,\Omega}$ denotes a family of multiplication operators rather than a single vector-valued multiplication operator. Let $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \Omega)$ denote the von Neumann algebra

$$\{M_{\phi_j},\ M^*_{\phi_j} : 1 \leq j \leq n\}',$$

which consists of all bounded operators on $L^2_a(\Omega)$ commuting with both M_{ϕ_j} and $M^*_{\phi_j}$ for each j. It is known that there is a close connection between orthogonal projections in $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi,\Omega)$ and all joint reducing subspaces of $\{M_{\phi_j} : 1 \le j \le n\}$. Precisely, the range of an orthogonal projection in $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi,\Omega)$ is exactly an joint reducing subspaces of $\{M_{\phi_j} : 1 \le j \le n\}$, and vice versa. We say that $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi,\Omega)$ is trivial if $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi,\Omega) = \mathbb{C}I$. This is equivalent to that $\{M_{\phi_j} : 1 \le j \le n\}$ has no nonzero joint reducing subspace other than the whole space. In single-variable case, investigations on commutants and reducing subspaces of multiplication operators and von Neumann algebras induced by those operators have been done in [Cow1, Cow2, Cow3, CW, DPW, DSZ, GH1, GH2, GH3, GH4, SZZ, T1, T2]. For multi-variable case, one can refer to [DH, GW, HZ, Ti, WDH].

This paper consider a class of tuples Φ of holomorphic functions and the von Neumann related to the corresponding multiplication operators. It turns out that techniques of geometry, complex analysis and operator theory are intrinsic in the study.

Suppose Ω_1 and Ω_2 are two bounded domains in $\mathbb{C}$, ϕ and ψ are holomorphic on Ω_1 and Ω_2, respectively. Define

$$\Upsilon_{\phi,\psi}(z_1,z_2) = (\phi(z_1)+\psi_2(z_2), \phi(z_1)^2+\psi(z_2)^2),\ z_1\in\Omega_1, z_2\in\Omega_2.$$

Define

$$\mathcal{S}_{\phi,\psi} = \{(z,w)\in\Omega_1\times\Omega_2 : z\notin \phi^{-1}\circ\psi\Big(Z(\psi')\Big),\ z\notin\psi^{-1}\circ\phi\Big(Z(\phi')\Big)\}.$$

Under some situations, $\mathcal{S}_{\phi,\psi}$ turns out to be a Riemann surface, and then let $n(\phi,\psi)$ denote the number of components of $\mathcal{S}_{\phi,\psi}$. We have the dimension formula for $\mathcal{V}^*(\Upsilon_{\phi_1,\phi_2},\Omega_1\times\Omega_2)$.

Theorem 1.1. *Suppose that ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 are holomorphic proper maps over bounded domains Ω_1 and Ω_2 in $\mathbb{C}$, respectively. If $\phi_1(\Omega_1)=\phi_2(\Omega_2)$, then*

$$\dim\mathcal{V}^*(\Upsilon_{\phi_1,\phi_2},\Omega_1\times\Omega_2) = n(\phi_1,\phi_1)n(\phi_2,\phi_2)+n(\phi_1,\phi_2)^2.$$

In this case, $\mathcal{V}^*(\Upsilon_{\phi_1,\phi_2},\Omega_1\times\Omega_2)$ is not $*$-isomorphic to the von Neumann algebra $\mathcal{V}^*(\phi_1(z_1),\phi_2(z_2),\Omega_1\times\Omega_2) = \mathcal{V}^*(\phi_1,\Omega_1)\otimes\mathcal{V}^*(\phi_2,\Omega_2)$.

The condition $\phi_1(\Omega_1)=\phi_2(\Omega_2)$ can not be weaken to $\overline{\phi_1(\Omega_1)}=\overline{\phi_2(\Omega_2)}$, as illustrated by Example 3.3.

In Theorem 1.1, if both ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 are finite Blaschke products, then we get something interesting. The following shows that the abelian property of $\mathcal{V}^*(\Upsilon_{B_1,B_2},\mathbb{D}^2)$ heavily rests on the connectedness of the Riemann surface $\mathcal{S}_{B_1,B_2}$.

Theorem 1.2. *Write* $\Upsilon_{B_1,B_2}(z) = (B_1(z_1) + B_2(z_2), B_1(z_1)^2 + B_2(z_2)^2)$, *where both* B_1 *and* B_2 *are finite Blaschke products. Then* $\mathcal{V}^*(\Upsilon_{B_1,B_2}, \mathbb{D}^2)$ *is abelian if and only if* $\mathcal{S}_{B_1,B_2}$ *is connected.*

As a special case, the von Neumann algebra $\mathcal{V}^*(z_1^k + z_2^l, z_1^{2k} z_2^{2l}, \mathbb{D}^2)$ is abelian if and only if $GCD(k,l) = 1$ (Example 4.2). Besides, if more than two finite Blaschke products are involved, a generalization of Theorem 1.2 fails, see Example 4.3.

For one-variable holomorphic functions f and g, let

$$\Upsilon_{f,g} = (f(z_1) + g(z_2), f(z_1)^2 + g(z_2)^2).$$

By contrast with Theorem 1.1, the following is of interest.

Proposition 1.3. *Suppose that* f *and* g *are holomorphic maps over* $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$. *If* $\overline{f(\mathbb{D})} \neq \overline{g(\mathbb{D})}$, *then* $\mathcal{V}^*(\Upsilon_{f,g}, \mathbb{D}^2)$ *is* $*$*-isomorphic to* $\mathcal{V}^*(f, \mathbb{D}) \otimes \mathcal{V}^*(g, \mathbb{D})$. *Furthermore,* $\mathcal{V}^*(\Upsilon_{f,g}, \mathbb{D}^2)$ *is abelian.*

To generalize the above result, we introduce a notion called local solution. Throughout this paper, without other explanation we always assume that Ω *is a bounded domain in* $\mathbb{C}^d$ *such that the interior of* $\overline{\Omega}$ *equals* Ω. For two holomorphic maps Φ and Ψ from Ω to $\mathbb{C}^d$, if there is a subdomain Δ of Ω and a holomorphic function ρ over Δ such that

$$\Psi(\rho(z)) = \Phi(z),\ z \in \Delta,$$

then ρ is called *a local solution*. If Φ and Ψ are holomorphic proper maps over Ω, one can define a complex manifold $\mathcal{S}_{\Phi,\Psi}$, which equals

$$\{(z,w) \in \Omega : \Psi(w) = \Phi(z)\}$$

minus some small subset. We also generalize the definition of a holomorphic map $\Upsilon_{\Phi,\Psi}$. For convenience, let Ω be a domain in $\mathbb{C}^2$ and

$$\Phi(z_1,z_2) = (\phi_1(z_1,z_2), \phi_2(z_1,z_2)),\ \Psi(z_1,z_2) = (\psi_1(z_1,z_2), \psi_2(z_1,z_2)),$$

where $(z_1,z_2) \in \Omega$. Write $P(z) = (\sum_{j=1}^4 z_j, \sum_{j=1}^4 z_j^2, \cdots, \sum_{j=1}^4 z_j^4)$, and $\Upsilon_{\Phi,\Psi}$ is defined by

$$\Upsilon_{\Phi,\Psi}(z_1,z_2,z_3,z_4) = P \circ \big(\Phi(z_1,z_2), \Psi(z_3,z_4)\big),\ (z_1,z_2,z_3,z_4) \in \Omega^2,$$

called the twisted map of Φ and Ψ. Then we have the following.

Theorem 1.4. *Suppose Φ and Ψ are two holomorphic proper maps over Ω such that $\overline{\Phi(\Omega)} \neq \overline{\Psi(\Omega)}$, and both Φ and Ψ are holomorphic on $\overline{\Omega}$. Assume that $\Upsilon_{\Phi,\Psi}$ has no nontrivial compatible equation. Then $\mathcal{V}^*(\Upsilon_{\Phi,\Psi}, \Omega^2)$ is $*$-isomorphic to $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \Omega) \otimes \mathcal{V}^*(\Psi, \Omega)$.*

The condition of $\Upsilon_{\Phi,\Psi}$ having no nontrivial compatible equation is quite geometric, and such a condition is easy to check under many cases, see below (5.5). In addition, Theorem 1.4 still holds if Ω is a domain in $\mathbb{C}^d (d \geq 1)$.

This paper is arranged as follows.

In Section 2 we give some preliminaries. Section 3 gives the definition and studies some properties of local solution, and provides the proof of Theorem 1.1. Section 4 mainly establishes Theorem 1.2 and discusses some related examples. As is shown, there is an interplay between operator theory, geometry and complex analysis. Section 5 aims to give a generalization of these results. We focus on two twisted holomorphic proper maps and present the proof of Theorem 1.4.

2 Some preliminaries

This section gives some preliminaries, including proper map, zero variety and local inverse, which will be useful later.

Let $\Omega, \Omega_0, \Omega_1$ be domains in $\mathbb{C}^d$. A holomorphic function $\Psi : \Omega_0 \to \Omega_1$ is called *a proper map* if for any sequence $\{p_n\}(p_n \in \Omega_0)$ without limit point in Ω_0, $\{\Psi(p_n)\}$ has no limit point in Ω_1. A holomorphic function Ψ on Ω is called proper if $\Psi(\Omega)$ is open and $\Psi : \Omega \to \Psi(\Omega)$ is proper. In particular, if Ψ is holomorphic on $\overline{\Omega}$, then Ψ is proper on Ω if and only if $\Psi(\Omega)$ is open and

$$\Psi(\partial\Omega) \subseteq \partial\Psi(\Omega).$$

For example, a holomorphic map Φ from $\mathbb{D}^d$ to $\mathbb{D}^d$ is proper if and only if up to a permutation of coordinates

$$\Phi(z) = (\phi_1(z_1), \cdots, \phi_d(z_d)),$$

where each $\phi_j (1 \leq j \leq d)$ is a finite Blaschke product ([Ru1, Theorem 7.3.3]).

In general, a holomorphic proper map is open, which follows directly from [Ru2, Theorem 15.1.6], see the following.

Theorem 2.1. *Suppose $F : \Omega \to \mathbb{C}^d$ is a holomorphic function and for each $w \in \mathbb{C}^d$, $F^{-1}(w)$ is compact. Then F is an open map.*

Let $F : \Omega \to \mathbb{C}^d$ be a holomorphic map and Z denotes the zeros of the determinant of the Jacobian of F. Then its image $F(Z)$ is called *the critical set* of F. Each point in $F(Z)$ is called a critical value, and each point in $F(\Omega) - F(Z)$ is called a regular point. A holomorphic proper map is always an m-folds map, and its critical set is a zero variety ([Ru2, Theorem 15.1.9]), stated as below.

Theorem 2.2. *Given two domains Ω and Ω_0 in $\mathbb{C}^d$, suppose $F : \Omega \to \Omega_0$ is a holomorphic proper function. Let $\sharp(w)$ denote the number of points in $F^{-1}(w)$ with $w \in \Omega_0$. Then the following hold:*

(1) *There is an integer m such that $\sharp(w) = m$ for all regular values w of F and $\sharp(w') < m$ for all critical values w' of F;*

(2) *The critical set of F is a zero variety in Ω_0.*

A subset E of Ω is called *a zero variety* of Ω if there is a nonconstant holomorphic function f on Ω such that $E = \{z \in \Omega | f(z) = 0\}$. A relatively closed subset V of Ω is called *an (analytic) subvariety* of Ω if for each point w in Ω there is a neighborhood $\mathcal{N}$ of w such that $V \cap \mathcal{N}$ equals the intersection of zeros of finitely many holomorphic functions over $\mathcal{N}$.

An easier version of Remmert's Proper Mapping Theorem reads as follows, see [Ch, p. 65] or [Re1, Re2].

Theorem 2.3. *If $f : \Omega_0 \to \Omega_1$ is a holomorphic proper map and $\mathcal{Z}$ is a subvariety of Ω_0, then $f(\mathcal{Z})$ is a subvariety of Ω_1.*

We need some notions about analytic continuation ([Ru3, Chapter 16]). A function element is an ordered pair (f, D), where D is an open ball in $\mathbb{C}^d$ and f is a holomorphic function on D. Two function elements (f_0, D_0) and (f_1, D_1) are called direct continuations if $D_0 \cap D_1$ is not empty and $f_0 = f_1$ holds on $D_0 \cap D_1$. A curve is a continuous map from $[0, 1]$ into $\mathbb{C}^d$. For a function element (f_0, D_0) and a curve γ with $\gamma(0) \in D_0$, if there is a partition of $[0, 1]$:

$$0 = s_0 < s_1 < \cdots < s_n = 1$$

and function elements $(f_j, D_j)(0 \le j \le n)$ such that

1. (f_j, D_j) and (f_{j+1}, D_{j+1}) are direct continuation for all j with $0 \le j \le n - 1$;

2. $\gamma[s_j, s_{j+1}] \subseteq D_j (0 \le j \le n - 1)$ and $\gamma(1) \in D_n$,

then (f_n, D_n) is called *an analytic continuation of* (f_0, D_0) *along* γ ; and (f_0, D_0) is called to *admit* an analytic continuation along γ. In this case, we write $f_0 \sim f_n$. Clearly, $\sim$ defines an equivalence and we write $[f]$ for *the equivalent class* of f.

As follows, we will give a generalization of local inverse. For convenience, assume both Φ and Ψ are holomorphic maps from $\overline{\Omega}$ to $\mathbb{C}^d$. Write

$$Z(J\Phi) = \mathcal{Z}_\Phi \quad \text{and} \quad Z(J\Psi) = \mathcal{Z}_\Psi.$$

Let

$$\mathcal{S}_{\Phi,\Psi} = \{(z,w) \in \Omega : \Psi(w) = \Phi(z), z \notin \Phi^{-1}\big(\overline{\Psi(\mathcal{Z}_\Psi)}\big)\}.$$

and

$$\mathcal{S}_{\Psi,\Phi} = \{(z,w) \in \Omega : \Phi(w) = \Psi(z), z \notin \Psi^{-1}\big(\overline{\Phi(\mathcal{Z}_\Phi)}\big)\}.$$

It can happen that $\mathcal{S}_{\Phi,\Psi}$ or $\mathcal{S}_{\Psi,\Phi}$ is empty, but in interesting cases they are Riemann manifolds. If there is a subdomain Δ of Ω and a holomorphic function ρ over Δ such that

$$\Psi(\rho(z)) = \Phi(z),\ z \in \Delta,$$

then ρ is called *a local solution* for $\mathcal{S}_{\Phi,\Psi}$, denoted by

$$\rho \in \Psi^{-1} \circ \Phi.$$

In particular, if $\Phi = \Psi$, then ρ is called *a local inverse* of Φ [T1] and we rewrite S_Φ for $\mathcal{S}_{\Phi,\Phi}$. Following [HZ], a local solution ρ for $\mathcal{S}_{\Phi,\Psi}$ is called *admissible* if for each curve γ in $\Omega - \Phi^{-1}\big(\overline{\Psi(\mathcal{Z}_\Psi)}\big)$, ρ admits analytic continuation with values in Ω. In this case, we say ρ is admissible with respect to $\Phi^{-1}\big(\overline{\Psi(\mathcal{Z}_\Psi)}\big)$. It can be shown that $\Omega - \Phi^{-1}\big(\overline{\Psi(\mathcal{Z}_\Psi)}\big)$ is connected if both Φ and Ψ are holomorphic on $\overline{\Omega}$.

Remark 2.4. *By assuming that both* Φ *and* Ψ *are holomorphic maps from* $\overline{\Omega}$ *to* $\mathbb{C}^d$*, we define* $\mathcal{S}_{\Phi,\Psi}$*,* $\mathcal{S}_{\Psi,\Phi}$ *and admissible local solution. Now let* Φ *and* Ψ *be holomorphic proper maps defined on* Ω *and*

$$\Phi(\Omega) = \Psi(\Omega).$$

In this case,

$$\Omega - \Phi^{-1}\big(\Psi(\mathcal{Z}_\Psi)\big)$$

is also connected. Furthermore,

$$\Psi^{-1}\big(\overline{\Phi(\mathcal{Z}_\Phi)}\big) = \Psi^{-1}\big(\Phi(\mathcal{Z}_\Phi)\big),$$

and

$$\Phi^{-1}\big(\overline{\Psi(\mathcal{Z}_\Psi)}\big) = \Phi^{-1}\big(\Psi(\mathcal{Z}_\Psi)\big).$$

To define $\mathcal{S}_{\Phi,\Psi}$, $\mathcal{S}_{\Psi,\Phi}$ *and etc., we must replace* $\overline{\Phi(\mathcal{Z}_\Phi)}$ *and* $\overline{\Psi(\mathcal{Z}_\Psi)}$ *with* $\Phi(\mathcal{Z}_\Phi)$ *and* $\Psi(\mathcal{Z}_\Psi)$, *respectively.*

Given an admissible local inverse ρ of Φ, define

$$\mathcal{E}_{[\rho]}h(z) = \sum_{\sigma\in[\rho]} h\circ\sigma(z)J\sigma(z), h \in L^2_a(\Omega), z \in \Omega - \Phi^{-1}\big(\overline{\Phi(\mathcal{Z}_\Phi)}\big).$$

The following results come from [HZ].

Theorem 2.5. *Suppose* $\Phi : \Omega \to \mathbb{C}^d$ *is holomorphic on* $\overline{\Omega}$ *and the image of* Φ *contains an interior point. Then* $\dim \mathcal{V}^*(\Phi,\Omega) < \infty$, *and* $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi,\Omega)$ *is generated by* $\mathcal{E}_{[\rho]}$, *where* ρ *run over admissible local inverses of* Φ.

Theorem 2.6. *Let* Ω *and* Ω_0 *be bounded domains in* $\mathbb{C}^d$. *Suppose* $\Phi : \Omega \to \Omega_0$ *is a holomorphic proper map. Then* $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi,\Omega)$ *is generated by* $\mathcal{E}_{[\rho]}$, *where* ρ *are local inverses of* Φ. *In particular, the dimension of* $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi,\Omega)$ *equals the number of components of* $\mathcal{S}_\Phi$.

3 Properties of local solutions

This section gives some properties of local solutions and the proof of Theorem 1.1 is presented.

For a domain Ω in $\mathbb{C}^d$, first assume that both Φ and Ψ are holomorphic on $\overline{\Omega}$. In this case, $\mathcal{S}_{\Phi,\Psi}$ is a nonempty set. For two local solutions ρ and σ for $\mathcal{S}_{\Phi,\Psi}$, if ρ is an analytic continuation of σ, then their images lie in a same component of $\mathcal{S}_{\Phi,\Psi}$, and vice versa. Therefore, *the number of classes of local solutions equals the number of components of* $\mathcal{S}_{\Phi,\Psi}$.

For simplicity, we modify $\mathcal{S}_{\Phi,\Psi}$ a bit by setting

$$\mathcal{S}_{\Phi,\Psi} = \Big\{(z,w) \in \Omega : \Psi(w) = \Phi(z), z \notin \Phi^{-1}\big(\overline{\Psi(\mathcal{Z}_\Psi)}\big),\ z \notin \Psi^{-1}\big(\overline{\Phi(\mathcal{Z}_\Phi)}\big)\Big\}.$$

That is,

$$\mathcal{S}_{\Phi,\Psi} = \Big\{(z,w) \in \Omega : \Psi(w) = \Phi(z)\} - \Gamma_{\Phi,\Psi}, \tag{3.1}$$

where

$$\Gamma_{\Phi,\Psi} = \{(z,w) \in \Omega : \Psi(w) = \Phi(z), z \in \Phi^{-1}\big(\overline{\Psi(\mathcal{Z}_\Psi)}\big) \cup \Psi^{-1}\big(\overline{\Phi(\mathcal{Z}_\Phi)}\big)\Big\}.$$

Note that the numbers of components of both original $\mathcal{S}_{\Phi,\Psi}$ and $\mathcal{S}_{\Psi,\Phi}$ remains invariant after we remove only a special set of complex codimension 1 away from them. This can be seen as follows. By [Ru2, Theorem 14.4.9], a zero variety of a domain in $\mathbb{C}^d$ can be represented as a union of compact sets L_n whose Hausdorff measures $h_{2d-2}(L_n) < \infty$. By [Ru2, Theorem 14.4.5], for a connected domain $\mathcal{U}$ in $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$, if a relatively closed set G of $\mathcal{U}$ can be written as the union of countably many compact sets K_n whose Hausdorff measure $h_t(K_n) < \infty$ for some $t \in (0, 2d-1)$, then $\mathcal{U} - G$ is connected. Note that $\Psi^{-1}\big(\overline{\Phi(\mathcal{Z}_\Phi)}\big)$ can be presented as a union of countably many compact sets whose Hausdorff dimensions are not larger than $2d-2$, as well as $\overline{\Phi(\mathcal{Z}_\Phi)}$. Letting $G = \Psi^{-1}\big(\overline{\Phi(\mathcal{Z}_\Phi)}\big)$ we have

$$\mathcal{O} - \Psi^{-1}\big(\overline{\Phi(\mathcal{Z}_\Phi)}\big)$$

is connected for any subdomain $\mathcal{O}$ of Ω. Note that $\mathcal{S}_{\Phi,\Psi}$ consists of disjoint connected open components. Since the complex manifold $\mathcal{S}_{\Phi,\Psi}$ defined by (3.1) is exactly the original one minus $\Psi^{-1}\big(\overline{\Phi(\mathcal{Z}_\Phi)}\big)$, they have the same number of components.

Note that $\mathcal{S}_{\Phi,\Psi}$ and $\mathcal{S}_{\Psi,\Phi}$ are equal now up to a permutation of coordinates, and they have the same number of components. Thus the numbers of equivalent classes of local solutions for $\mathcal{S}_{\Phi,\Psi}$ and $\mathcal{S}_{\Psi,\Phi}$ are exactly equal. Letting $n(\Phi,\Psi)$ denote the number of components of $\mathcal{S}_{\Phi,\Psi}$, we have the following.

Proposition 3.1. *Suppose one of the following holds:*

(*i*) *both* $\Phi : \Omega \to \Phi(\Omega)$ *and* $\Psi : \Omega \to \Psi(\Omega)$ *are holomorphic proper maps and* $\Phi(\Omega) = \Psi(\Omega)$;

(*ii*) *both* Φ *and* Ψ *are holomorphic over* $\overline{\Omega}$ *and their images in* $\mathbb{C}^d$ *have an interior point.*

Then $\mathcal{S}_{\Phi,\Psi}$ *and* $\mathcal{S}_{\Psi,\Phi}$ *have the same number of components; that is,* $n(\Phi,\Psi) = n(\Phi,\Psi)$.

Under Condition (i), the local solutions for $\mathcal{S}_{\Phi,\Psi}$ turn out to be admissible. The special case of $\Phi = \Psi$ is discussed in the proof of [HZ, Theorem 1.4].

Lemma 3.2. *Suppose that* Φ *and* Ψ *are holomorphic proper maps on* Ω *with same images. Then each local solution* ρ *for* $\mathcal{S}_{\Phi,\Psi}$ *is admissible in* Ω.

Proof. Suppose that Φ and Ψ are holomorphic proper maps on Ω with the same images. Write

$$A = \Phi^{-1}\big(\Psi(\mathcal{Z}_\Psi)\big).$$

Since Ψ are proper, by Theorem 2.2 $\Psi(\mathcal{Z}_\Psi)$ is a zero variety. Then $\Psi(\mathcal{Z}_\Psi)$ is relatively closed in $\Psi(\Omega)$, and thus A is relatively closed in Ω.

For each curve γ in $\Omega - A$, write $z_0 = \gamma(0)$. Given a local solution ρ satisfying

$$\Psi(\rho(z_0)) = \Phi(z_0),$$

we will prove that ρ admits analytic continuation along γ. To see this, note that Φ and Ψ has same images. For each point w on γ, $\Phi(w) \in \Psi(\Omega)$. Since $\gamma \subseteq \Omega - A$,

$$\Phi(\gamma) \cap \Psi(\mathcal{Z}_\Psi) = \emptyset.$$

By Theorem 2.2, there is a constant interger n depending only on Ψ so that $\Psi^{-1}(\Phi(w))$ has exactly n distinct points. Furthermore, there is an open ball U_w centered at w and n holomorphic maps $\rho_1^w, \cdots, \rho_n^w$ over U_w satisfying

$$\Psi(\rho_j^w(z)) = \Phi(z),\ z \in U_w,\ 1 \le j \le n.$$

Since γ is compact, by Henie-Borel's theorem there are finitely many such balls U_w whose union contains γ. Then it is straightforward to show that all $\rho_j^{z_0}$ $(1 \le j \le n)$ admit analytic continuation along γ. Since one of $\rho_j^{z_0}$ $(1 \le j \le n)$ is the direct continuation of ρ, ρ admits analytic continuation along γ. The proof is complete. □

We are ready to give the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Suppose that both ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 are holomorphic proper maps over bounded domains Ω_1 and Ω_2 in $\mathbb{C}$, respectively, and $\phi_1(\Omega_1) = \phi_2(\Omega_2)$. Let

$$\Omega = \phi_1(\Omega_1) = \phi_2(\Omega_2).$$

By Theorem 2.1 one can show that $(z_1 + z_2, z_1^2 + z_2^2)$ is an open map and by analysis it is a proper map on $\Omega\times\Omega$. Then as a composition of $(z_1+z_2, z_1^2+z_2^2)$ and $(\phi_1(z_1), \phi_2(z_2))$, Υ_{ϕ_1,ϕ_2} is a holomorphic proper map on $\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2$, and by Theorem 2.6 the von Neumann algebra $\mathcal{V}^*(\Upsilon_{\phi_1,\phi_2}, \Omega_1 \times \Omega_2)$ is generated by $\mathcal{E}_\rho$, where ρ run over local inverses of Υ_{ϕ_1,ϕ_2}. Note by Lemma 3.2 all these ρ are necessarily admissible.

Below we will determine the local inverse of Υ_{ϕ_1,ϕ_2}. Observe that

$$(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2, \lambda_1^2 + \lambda_2^2) = (\mu_1 + \mu_2, \mu_1^2 + \mu_2^2) \tag{3.2}$$

is equivalent to

$$(\lambda_1+\lambda_2, \lambda_1\lambda_2) = (\mu_1+\mu_2, \mu_1\mu_2),$$

Then (λ_1, λ_2) and (μ_1, μ_2) are the same zeros of a polynomial p counting multiplicity, with $p(x) = x^2 + (\lambda_1+\lambda_2)x + \lambda_1\lambda_2$. Thus the solutions for (3.2) are

$$(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) = (\mu_1, \mu_2)$$

and

$$(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) = (\mu_2, \mu_1).$$

By this observation, solving

$$\Upsilon_{\phi_1,\phi_2}(w_1, w_2) = \Upsilon_{\phi_1,\phi_2}(z_1, z_2)$$

is equivalent to solving

$$\begin{cases} \phi_1(w_1) = \phi_1(z_1), \\ \phi_2(w_2) = \phi_2(z_2), \end{cases}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} \phi_1(w_1) = \phi_2(z_2), \\ \phi_2(w_2) = \phi_1(z_1). \end{cases}$$

Then we have either

$$(w_1, w_2) = (\sigma_1(z_1), \sigma_2(z_2)),\ \sigma_1 \in \phi_1^{-1} \circ \phi_1,\ \sigma_2 \in \phi_2^{-1} \circ \phi_2, \tag{3.3}$$

or

$$(w_1, w_2) = (\tau_1(z_2), \tau_2(z_1)),\ \tau_1 \in \phi_1^{-1} \circ \phi_2,\ \sigma_2 \in \tau_2^{-1} \circ \phi_1.$$

Hence by Proposition 3.1 Υ_{ϕ_1,ϕ_2} has exactly $n(\phi_1,\phi_1)n(\phi_2,\phi_2) + n(\phi_1,\phi_2)^2$ equivalent classes for admissible local inverses. Since $\mathcal{V}^*(\Upsilon_{\phi_1,\phi_2}, \Omega_1 \times \Omega_2)$ is generated by $\mathcal{E}_\rho$ where ρ are admissible local inverses of Υ_{ϕ_1,ϕ_2},

$$\dim \mathcal{V}^*(\Upsilon_{\phi_1,\phi_2}, \Omega_1 \times \Omega_2) = n(\phi_1,\phi_1)n(\phi_2,\phi_2) + n(\phi_1,\phi_2)^2.$$

Since $\dim \mathcal{V}^*(\phi_j, \Omega_j) = n(\phi_j, \phi_j)$, $j = 1, 2$,

$$\dim \mathcal{V}^*(\phi_1, \Omega_1) \otimes \mathcal{V}^*(\phi_2, \Omega_2) = n(\phi_1,\phi_1)n(\phi_2,\phi_2) < \dim \mathcal{V}^*(\Upsilon_{\phi_1,\phi_2}, \Omega_1 \times \Omega_2).$$

Therefore, $\mathcal{V}^*(\Upsilon_{\phi_1,\phi_2}, \Omega_1 \times \Omega_2)$ is not $*$-isomorphic to the von Neumann algebra $\mathcal{V}^*(\phi_1, \Omega_1) \otimes \mathcal{V}^*(\phi_2, \Omega_2)$.

Besides, the map $(\phi_1(z_1), \phi_2(z_2))$ is a proper map whose local inverses are exactly of the form (3.3), and by Theorem 2.6

$$\mathcal{V}^*(\phi_1(z_1), \phi_2(z_2), \Omega_1 \times \Omega_2) = \mathcal{V}^*(\phi_1, \Omega_1) \otimes \mathcal{V}^*(\phi_2, \Omega_2).$$

The proof of Theorem 1.1 is finished. □

The following example shows that $\phi_1(\Omega_1) = \phi_2(\Omega_2)$ is sharp in the sense that it can not be replaced with $\overline{\phi_1(\Omega_1)} = \overline{\phi_2(\Omega_2)}$.

Example 3.3. *Put $\Omega = \mathbb{D} - [-1, 0]$. Write $f(z) = z, z \in \mathbb{D}$ and g is the restriction of f on Ω. Obviously, $f$and g are proper maps on $\mathbb{D}$ and Ω respectively. Set*

$$\Upsilon_{f,g}(z_1, z_2) = (z_1 + z_2, z_1^2 + z_2^2), z_1 \in \mathbb{D}, z_2 \in \Omega.$$

We will prove that

$$\mathcal{V}^*(\Upsilon_{f,g}, \mathbb{D} \times \Omega) = \mathbb{C}I;$$

equivalently, $\mathcal{V}^*(\Upsilon_{f,g}, \mathbb{D}\times\Omega)$ is $*$-isomorphic to $\mathcal{V}^*(f, \mathbb{D})\otimes\mathcal{V}^*(g, \Omega)$. For this, letting $\rho(z_1, z_2) = (z_2, z_1)$, we have that each operator S in $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi_{f,g}, \mathbb{D} \times \Omega)$ is of the form

$$Sh(z_1, z_2) = c_1 h(z_1, z_2) + c_2 h \circ \rho(z_1, z_2), (z_1, z_2) \in \mathbb{D} \times \Omega.$$

If $\mathcal{V}^*(\Upsilon_{f,g}, \mathbb{D} \times \Omega) \neq \mathbb{C}I$, $h \mapsto h \circ \rho$ defines a bounded linear operator on $L_a^2(\mathbb{D} \times \Omega)$, and it maps $L_a^2(\mathbb{D}) \otimes L_a^2(\Omega)$ to $L_a^2(\mathbb{D} \times \Omega)$. By the form of ρ, it is direct to check that each function in $L_a^2(\Omega)$ extends holomorphically to a function in $L_a^2(\mathbb{D})$. But this can not be true because $\ln z_1 \in L_a^2(\Omega)$ but $\ln z_1 \notin L_a^2(\mathbb{D})$ as $\ln z_1$ can not be extended to an holomorphic function over $\mathbb{D}$.

Suppose that Φ and Ψ are holomorphic proper maps on Ω with same images. Then the closure of the range of an admissible local solution and all its continuations equals that of Ω. To be precise, let σ be an admissible local solution for $\mathcal{S}_{\Phi,\Psi}$ and $[\sigma]$ denotes the equivalent class of σ, Image $[\sigma]$ denotes the union of all images of local solutions in the equivalent class of σ. By definition we have

$$\text{Image}\,[\sigma] \subseteq \Omega.$$

Then the inverse σ^- of σ is a local solution of $\mathcal{S}_{\Psi,\Phi}$. By Lemma 3.2, both σ and σ^- are admissible with respect to the set $\mathcal{E}$ defined by

$$\mathcal{E} = \Phi^{-1}(\Psi(\mathcal{Z}_\Psi))\bigcup \Psi^{-1}(\Phi(\mathcal{Z}_\Phi).$$

We address that $\Omega - \mathcal{E}$ is connected. Since σ^- or its continuation is well defined on each given point of $\Omega - \mathcal{E}$, the union of the images of σ and all its continuation contains $\Omega - \mathcal{E}$. That is,

$$\Omega - \mathcal{E} \subseteq \text{Image}\,[\sigma],$$

forcing

$$\Omega - \mathcal{E} \subseteq \text{Image}\,[\sigma] \subseteq \Omega.$$

Note that $\mathcal{E}$ is relatively closed subset of Ω with zero Lebesgue measure. We get the following.

Lemma 3.4. *If both Φ and Ψ are holomorphic proper maps on Ω with same images, then for each local solution σ for $\mathcal{S}_{\Phi,\Psi}$*

$$\overline{\text{Image}\,[\sigma]} = \overline{\Omega}. \tag{3.4}$$

In particular, in the case of $\Phi = \Psi$, (3.4) holds for each local inverse σ of a holomorphic proper map Φ over Ω.

Remark 3.5. *If Φ is holomorphic over $\overline{\Omega}$ and σ is an admissible local inverse of Φ, then (3.4) still holds. The reasoning is similar to the above discussion.*

4 Twisted finite Blaschke products

This section mainly establishes Theorem 1.2 and gives some examples for it. As we will see, there is an interplay between operator theory and geometry of Riemann manifold.

We first provide the proof of Theorem 1.2.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Let B_1 and B_2 be finite Blaschke products and write

$$\Upsilon_{B_1,B_2}(z) = (B_1(z_1) + B_2(z_2), B_1(z_1)^2 + B_2(z_2)^2),\ (z_1, z_2) \in \mathbb{D}^2.$$

Since Υ_{B_1,B_2} is the composition of two holomorphic proper maps $(z_1 + z_2, z_1^2 + z_2^2)$ and $(B_1(z_1), B_2(z_2))$, Υ_{B_1,B_2} is a holomorphic proper map on $\mathbb{D}^2$.

Below we will show that $\mathcal{V}^*(\Upsilon_{B_1,B_2}, \mathbb{D}^2)$ is abelian if and only if $\mathcal{S}_{B_1,B_2}$ is connected. To see this, by Theorem 2.5 studying $\mathcal{V}^*(\Upsilon_{B_1,B_2}, \mathbb{D}^2)$ reduces to studying admissible local inverses of Υ_{B_1,B_2}. For this, write

$$\Upsilon_{B_1,B_2}(w) = \Upsilon_{B_1,B_2}(z), w, z \in \mathbb{D}^2.$$

Then by discussion in the proof of Theorem 1.1, we get either

$$(w_1, w_2) = (\rho(z_1), \sigma(z_2)),\ \rho \in B_1^{-1} \circ B_1,\ \sigma \in B_2^{-1} \circ B_2, \tag{4.1}$$

or

$$(w_1, w_2) = (\zeta(z_2), \eta(z_1)),\ \zeta \in B_1^{-1} \circ B_2,\ \eta \in B_2^{-1} \circ B_1. \tag{4.2}$$

By Lemma 3.2 all ρ, σ, ζ and η are admissible, and the local inverses of Υ_{B_1,B_2} defined in (4.1) and (4.2) are also admissible.

To discuss the abelian property of $\mathcal{V}^*(\Upsilon_{B_1,B_2}, \mathbb{D}^2)$, we must study whether their equivalent class commute with each other under composition. This relies on whether $([\rho] \circ [\zeta](z_2), [\sigma] \circ [\eta](z_1))$ equals

$$([\zeta] \circ [\sigma](z_2), [\eta] \circ [\rho](z_1)).$$

Before continuing, one must determine what is the composition of two equivalent classes [GH3]. Observe that for any local inverses $[\tau_1]$ and $[\tau_2]$, $\mathcal{E}_{[\tau_1]}\mathcal{E}_{[\tau_2]}$ has the form

$$\sum_j \mathcal{E}_{[\sigma_j]},$$

where the sum is finite and some σ_j may lie in the same class; and we define *the composition*

$$[\tau_1] \circ [\tau_2]$$

to be a formal sum $\sum_j [\sigma_j]$. Thus

$$\mathcal{E}_{[\tau_1]}\mathcal{E}_{[\tau_2]} = \mathcal{E}_{[\tau_2]}\mathcal{E}_{[\tau_1]}$$

if and only if $[\tau_1] \circ [\tau_2] = [\tau_2] \circ [\tau_1]$. The formal sum of k same equivalent classes $[\sigma]$ is denoted by $k[\sigma]$.

Since a finite Blaschke product has no critical point on the unit circle $\mathbb{T}$, it is conformal on $\mathbb{T}$. Thus for $j, k = 1, 2$ the local solutions for $\mathcal{S}_{B_j,B_k}$ are holomorphic on a neighborhood of each point on $\mathbb{T}$. For these local solutions, we just discuss their behavior on the unit circle $\mathbb{T}$. Suppose order $B_1 = m$ and order $B_2 = n$. Let $a_1, \cdots, a_m$ be m distinct points on $\mathbb{T}$ and $b_1, \cdots, b_n$ be n distinct points on $\mathbb{T}$, both in anti-clockwise direction and satisfying

$$B_1(a_j) = B_2(b_k) = 1,\ 1 \le j \le m,\ 1 \le k \le n. \tag{4.3}$$

Suppose S_{B_1,B_2} is not connected. That is, S_{B_1,B_2} has more than one component. Let $[\zeta](a_1)$ denote the set of all $\widetilde{\zeta}(a_1)$ as $\widetilde{\zeta}$ run over all analytic continuations along loops in $\mathbb{T}$ beginning at a_1. Writing

$$[\zeta](a_1) = \{b_k : k \in \Lambda\},$$

we have

$$[\zeta](a_1) \neq \{b_1, \cdots, b_n\}.$$

Thus there is at least a local solution η of S_{B_1,B_2} such that $\eta(a_1) \notin [\zeta](a_1)$. Write

$$\eta(a_1) = b_{j_0}.$$

By conformal property of B_1 and B_2 on $\mathbb{T}$, local solutions for S_{B_1,B_2} (or S_{B_2,B_1}) admit continuation along any curve in $\mathbb{T}$. In particular, by (4.3) there is an a_j such that $\zeta^{-1}(b_{j_0}) = a_j$, forcing

$$\zeta(a_j) = b_{j_0}.$$

Let ρ be the identity map, and σ be the local inverse of B_1 determined by $\sigma(a_1) = a_j$. Then

$$b_{j_0} \in \zeta \circ \sigma(a_1).$$

Noting that $\eta(a_1) = b_{j_0}$, we deduce that $[\zeta] \circ [\sigma]$ must contain $[\eta]$. But

$$[\rho] \circ [\zeta] = [\zeta] \neq [\eta].$$

Therefore, $[\rho] \circ [\zeta] \neq [\zeta] \circ [\sigma]$, forcing

$$([\rho] \circ [\zeta](z_2), [\sigma] \circ [\eta](z_1)) \neq ([\zeta] \circ [\sigma](z_2), [\eta] \circ [\rho](z_1)).$$

This means that there are two equivalences of admissible local inverses of Υ_{B_1,B_2}, (4.1) and (4.2), do not commute. Then by Theorem 2.5 $\mathcal{V}^*(\Upsilon_{B_1,B_2}, \mathbb{D}^2)$ is not abelian.

Now assume S_{B_1,B_2} is connected. That is, S_{B_1,B_2} has only one component as well as S_{B_2,B_1}. In this case we will prove that $\mathcal{V}^*(\Upsilon_{B_1,B_2}, \mathbb{D}^2)$ is abelian. First, it will be shown that the equivalence of a local inverse (4.1) commutes with that of (4.2). Assume $[\zeta]$ and $[\eta]$ are the only equivalent classes for local solutions of S_{B_1,B_2} and S_{B_2,B_1}, respectively. By careful analysis of boundary behaviors of B_1 and B_2, we get

$$[\rho] \circ [\zeta] = \sharp[\rho] \cdot [\zeta] \quad \text{and} \quad [\sigma] \circ [\eta] = \sharp[\sigma] \cdot [\eta].$$

Thus, letting z_1 and z_2 denote complex variables gives

$$([\rho] \circ [\zeta](z_2), [\sigma] \circ [\eta](z_1)) = \sharp[\rho] \cdot \sharp[\sigma]([\zeta](z_2), [\eta](z_1)).$$

Similarly,

$$([\zeta] \circ [\sigma](z_2), [\eta] \circ [\rho](z_1)) = \sharp[\rho] \cdot \sharp[\sigma]([\zeta](z_2), [\eta](z_1)),$$

which gives

$$([\rho] \circ [\zeta](z_2), [\sigma] \circ [\eta](z_1)) = ([\zeta] \circ [\sigma](z_2), [\eta] \circ [\rho](z_1)).$$

Thus, the equivalence of a local inverse (4.1) commutes with the equivalence of (4.2).

As follows, we will prove that two equivalences of local inverses with the form (4.1) commutes. In fact, since B_1 is a finite Blaschke product, by [DPW, Theorem 1.1] $\mathcal{V}^*(B_1, \mathbb{D})$ is abelian. Since $\mathcal{V}^*(B_1, \mathbb{D})$ is generated by $\mathcal{E}_{[\rho]}$ where ρ are local inverses of B_1, we have

$$[\rho_1] \circ [\rho_2] = [\rho_2] \circ [\rho_1],\ \rho_1, \rho_2 \in B_1^{-1} \circ B_1.$$

Similarly,

$$[\sigma_1] \circ [\sigma_2] = [\sigma_2] \circ [\sigma_1],\ \sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in B_2^{-1} \circ B_2.$$

Therefore, we have

$$([\rho_1](z_1), [\sigma_1](z_2)) \circ ([\rho_2](z_1), [\sigma_2](z_2)) = ([\rho_2](z_1), [\sigma_2](z_2)) \circ ([\rho_1](z_1), [\sigma_1](z_2)).$$

In addition, one can prove that any two equivalences of local inverses of the form (4.2) commute with each other. In summary, all admissible local inverses of Υ_{B_1,B_2} commute with each other under composition. Therefore, if S_{B_1,B_2} is connected, $\mathcal{V}^*(\Upsilon_{B_1,B_2}, \mathbb{D}^2)$ is abelian. The proof is complete. $\square$

Some special cases of Theorem 1.2 are of interest. If $B_1 = B_2$, one component of $\mathcal{S}_{B_1,B_2}$ is $\{(z, z) : z \in \mathbb{D} - J\}$, where J is a finite set. Therefore, $\mathcal{S}_{B_1,B_1}$ is connected if and only if order B_1=1. This immediately gives [HZ, Example 6.5].

In the case of $B_1 \neq B_2$, things are interesting, see the following.

Corollary 4.1. *Let B_1 and B_2 be two finite Blaschke products. Write $m = \operatorname{order} B_1$, and $n = \operatorname{order} B_2$. If $GCD(m, n) = 1$, then $\mathcal{V}^*(\Upsilon_{B_1,B_2}, \mathbb{D}^2)$ is abelian.*

Proof. Recall that $\mathcal{S}_{B_1,B_2}$ is connected if and only if all local solution for $\mathcal{S}_{B_1,B_2}$ are equivalent in the sense of analytic continuation. By Theorem 1.2, it suffices to show that if $GCD(m, n) = 1$, then all local solutions for $\mathcal{S}_{B_1,B_2}$ are equivalent. For this, note that the proof of Theorem 1.2 has shown that a local solution for S_{B_1,B_2} admits continuation along any curve contained in $\mathbb{T}$. Without loss of generality, $m > n$. Let a_j and b_k be chosen as in the proof of Theorem 1.2. Suppose ζ is a local solution satisfying

$$\zeta(a_1) = b_1.$$

Note that for $1 \leq j \leq m-1$ and $1 \leq k \leq n-1$, the image of the circular arc $\widetilde{a_j a_{j+1}}$ under B_1 is the same as that of the circular arc $\widetilde{b_k b_{k+1}}$ under B_2. Then we get

$$\widetilde{\zeta}(a_j) = b_j,\ 1 \leq j \leq m.$$

where $\widetilde{\zeta}$ denotes some analytic continuation along a circular curve γ in $\mathbb{T}$. Letting γ go a bit further, and noting $\widetilde{\zeta}(a_m) = b_m$, we have

$$\breve{\zeta}(a_1) = b_{m+1},$$

where $\breve{\zeta}$ is also an analytic continuation of ζ. This procedure can be repeated. Since $GCD(m,n) = 1$, for each $k(1 \leq k \leq n)$ there exists an analytic continuation η of ζ such that

$$\eta(a_1) = b_k.$$

Thus all local solutions for $\mathcal{S}_{B_1,B_2}$ is an analytic continuation of ζ, and hence $\mathcal{S}_{B_1,B_2}$ has exactly one component. That is, $\mathcal{S}_{B_1,B_2}$ is connected to finish the proof. □

The inverse of Corollary 4.1 fails in general. However, the following shows it holds in a special case.

Example 4.2. *Write $B_1(\lambda) = \lambda^k$ and $B_2(\lambda) = \lambda^l$, where $\lambda \in \mathbb{D}$ and $k, l \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. We claim that $\mathcal{S}_{B_1,B_2}$ is connected if and only if*

$$GCD(k,l) = 1.$$

Then by Theorem 1.2 $\mathcal{V}^*(z_1^k + z_2^l, z_1^{2k} + z_2^{2l}, \mathbb{D}^2)$ is abelian if and only if

$$GCD(k,l) = 1,$$

if and only if $\mathcal{V}^*(z_1^k + z_2^l, \mathbb{D}^2)$ is abelian. The latter statement follows directly from [DH, Theorem 1.1].

To finish the proof, we must show that $\mathcal{S}_{B_1,B_2}$ is connected if and only if

$$GCD(k,l) = 1.$$

In fact, by the discussion in the above paragraph, if $GCD(k,l) = 1$, then $\mathcal{S}_{B_1,B_2}$ is connected. Now suppose $GCD(k,l) = d_0 > 1$. Write $\omega_j = \exp(\frac{j2\pi i}{k})$ and

$$\varsigma_j = \exp(\frac{j2\pi i}{l}),\ j \in \mathbb{Z}_+.$$

Let η denote local solution for $\mathcal{S}_{B_1,B_2}$ satisfying $\eta(\omega_1) = \varsigma_1$. Note that each local solution for $\mathcal{S}_{B_1,B_2}$ admits analytic continuation along any curve in $\mathbb{C} - \{0\}$. All continuations of η can be realized by a loop on $\mathbb{T}$. Then it is not difficult to see that

$$[\eta](\omega_1) = \{\varsigma_{1+md_0} : m \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}.$$

Clearly, $[\eta](\omega_1) \neq \{\varsigma_j : j \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$. *Let* j_0 *be an integer such that*

$$\varsigma_{j_0} \notin [\eta](\omega_1),$$

and let ζ *denote the local solution for* $\mathcal{S}_{B_1,B_2}$ *satisfying* $\zeta(\omega_1) = \varsigma_{j_0}$. *Then*

$$[\eta] \neq [\zeta].$$

Thus there are at least two components of $\mathcal{S}_{B_1,B_2}$, *forcing* $\mathcal{S}_{B_1,B_2}$ *not to be connected as desired.*

Theorem 1.2 fails if more than two Blaschke products are involved. The following shows that the number of variables play an important role here.

Example 4.3. *Let* $d \geq 3$. *For* d *Blaschke products* B_1, $B_2 \cdots, B_d$, *let* $\Phi(z)$ *denote*

$$(\sum_{k=1}^{d} B_k(z_k), \sum_{k=1}^{d} B_k(z_k)^2, \cdots, \sum_{k=1}^{d} B_k(z_k)^d).$$

Then $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \mathbb{D}^d)$ *is not abelian.*

We will just deal with the case of $d = 3$, *and the remaining case can be similarly handled. Consider some solutions for the equation* $\Phi(w) = \Phi(z)$:

$$\begin{cases} B_1(w_1) = B_2(z_2) \\ B_2(w_2) = B_1(z_1) \\ B_3(w_3) = B_3(z_3) \end{cases}$$

Then $(w_1, w_2, w_3) = (\zeta_{1,2}(z_2), \zeta_{2,1}(z_1), \zeta_{3,3}(z_3))$, *where*

$$\zeta_{j,k} \in B_j^{-1} \circ B_k (1 \leq j, k \leq 3)$$

are admissible local solutions. Also, write

$$\begin{cases} B_1(w_1) = B_3(z_3) \\ B_2(w_2) = B_2(z_2) \\ B_3(w_3) = B_1(z_1) \end{cases}$$

Then we get some other admissible local inverses of Φ*:*

$$(\zeta_{1,3}(z_3), \zeta_{2,2}(z_2), \zeta_{3,1}(z_1)).$$

By taking the compositions of their equivalent classes, we get

$$([\zeta_{1,2}] \circ [\zeta_{2,2}](z_2), [\zeta_{2,1}] \circ [\zeta_{1,3}](z_3), [\zeta_{3,3}] \circ [\zeta_{3,1}](z_1)),$$

and

$$([\zeta_{1,3}] \circ [\zeta_{3,3}](z_3), [\zeta_{2,2}] \circ [\zeta_{2,1}](z_1), [\zeta_{3,1}] \circ [\zeta_{1,2}](z_2)).$$

Clearly, they are not equal since the variables do not match. Thus not all equivalent classes of local inverse commute with each other under composition. Therefore, by Theorem 2.5 $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \mathbb{D}^d)$ *is not abelian.*

5 General twisted proper maps

This section mainly generalize the results in the last section. We will focus on two twisted holomorphic proper maps and present the proof of Theorem 1.4.

To begin with, we give a general setting. Let $F = (f_1, \cdots, f_d)$ be a holomorphic function over a domain on $\mathbb{C}^d$. Define

$$\Upsilon_F(z) = (\varphi_1(z), \cdots, \varphi_d(z)), \tag{5.1}$$

where

$$\varphi_1(z) = \sum_{j=1}^{d} f_j(z), \varphi_2(z) = \sum_{j=1}^{d} f_j(z)^2, \cdots$$

and $\varphi_d(z) = \sum_{1\le j\le d} f_j(z)^d$. Write

$$\psi_1 = \varphi_1, \psi_2(z) = \sum_{1\le j<k\le d} f_j(z) f_k(z), \cdots$$

and $\psi_d(z) = \Pi_{1\le j\le d} f_j(z)$. Consider the equation

$$\Upsilon_F(w) = \Upsilon_F(z);$$

that is,

$$(\varphi_1(w), \cdots, \varphi_d(w)) = (\varphi_1(z), \cdots, \varphi_d(z)).$$

This is equivalent to

$$(\psi_1(w), \cdots, \psi_d(w)) = (\psi_1(z), \cdots, \psi_d(z)).$$

Note that

$$x^d - \psi_1(z)x^{d-1} + \cdots + (-1)^{d-1}\psi_{d-1}(z)x + (-1)^d\psi_d(z) = \prod_{j=1}^{d}(x - f_j(z)),$$

and then $(f_1(w), \cdots, f_d(w))$ is a permutation of $(f_1(z), \cdots, f_d(z))$. Thus solving the equation $\Upsilon_F(w) = \Upsilon_F(z)$ is equivalent to solving all equations:

$$f_j(w) = f_{\pi(j)}(z),\ 1 \le j \le d, \tag{5.2}$$

where π runs over all permutations of $\{1, \cdots, d\}$.

A special case of (5.2) will be our focus. For simplicity, let Ω be a bounded domain in $\mathbb{C}^2$. Let $\Phi = (\phi_1, \phi_2)$ and $\Psi = (\psi_1, \psi_2)$ be holomorphic proper maps over Ω satisfying

$$\Phi(\Omega) = \Psi(\Omega).$$

In addition, we assume both of them are holomorphic on $\overline{\Omega}$. Write

$$f_1(z) = \phi_1(z_1, z_2), f_2(z) = \phi_2(z_1, z_2),$$

and

$$f_3(z) = \psi_1(z_3, z_4), f_4(z) = \psi_2(z_3, z_4).$$

Put $F = (f_1, \cdots, f_4)$, and rewrite $\Upsilon_{\Phi,\Psi} = \Upsilon_F$. To investigate the structure of $\mathcal{V}^*(\Upsilon_{\Phi,\Psi}, \Omega^2)$, we must determine all admissible local inverses for $\Upsilon_{\Phi,\Psi}$ on Ω^2. Among them, two admissible local inverses are related to $\mathcal{S}_\Phi$, $\mathcal{S}_\Psi$, and $\mathcal{S}_{\Phi,\Psi}$. Precisely, let

$$(\Phi(w_1, w_2), \Psi(w_3, w_4)) = (\Phi(z_1, z_2), \Psi(z_3, z_4)),$$

and

$$(\Phi(w_1, w_2), \Psi(w_3, w_4)) = (\Psi(z_3, z_4), \Phi(z_1, z_2)).$$

We get their solutions $w = (w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4)$:

$$w = (\sigma_1(z_1, z_2), \sigma_2(z_3, z_4)),\ \sigma_1 \in \Phi^{-1} \circ \Phi, \sigma_2 \in \Psi^{-1} \circ \Psi, \tag{5.3}$$

and

$$w = (\eta_1(z_3, z_4), \eta_2(z_1, z_2)),\ \eta_1 \in \Phi^{-1} \circ \Psi, \eta_2 \in \Psi^{-1} \circ \Phi. \tag{5.4}$$

By Lemma 3.2, both (5.3) and (5.4) give admissible local inverses of $\Upsilon_{\Phi,\Psi}$.

It is possible that there exists admissible local inverse not of the form (5.3) or (5.4). The following is such an example.

Example 5.1. *Let $\Omega = \mathbb{D}^2$, put $\Phi(z_1, z_2) = (B_1(z_1), B_2(z_2))$ and*

$$\Psi(z_1, z_2) = (B_3(z_1), B_4(z_2)),$$

where $B_1, \cdots, B_4$ are finite Blaschke products. In this case, we have more admissible local inverses of $\Upsilon_{\Phi,\Psi}$. In fact, for a permutation π of $\{1, \cdots, 4\}$ (5.2) gives

$$B_j(w_j) = B_{\pi(j)}(z_{\pi(j)}),$$

and this gives admissible local inverses

$$(\rho_1(z_{\pi(1)}), \cdots, \rho_4(z_{\pi(4)})),\ \rho_j \in B_j^{-1} \circ B_{\pi(j)}, 1 \le j \le 4.$$

Since there are many choices of π, $\Upsilon_{\Phi,\Psi}$ has a lot of admissible local inverses.

Let (g_1, g_2, g_3, g_4) be a permutation of (f_1, f_2, f_3, f_4). By (5.2), we get

$$(f_1(w), f_2(w), f_3(w), f_4(w)) = (g_1(z), g_2(z), g_3(z), g_4(z)).$$

Letting ρ be a local inverse of $\Upsilon_{\Phi,\Psi}$ gives

$$(f_1(\rho(z)), f_2(\rho(z)), f_3(\rho(z)), f_4(\rho(z))) = (g_1(z), g_2(z), g_3(z), g_4(z)), z \in \Omega - \mathcal{E},$$

where $\mathcal{E}$ is a subset of Ω with zero Lebesgue measure. Then by (3.4) we get

$$\overline{(f_1, f_2, f_3, f_4)(\Omega^2)} = \overline{(g_1, g_2, g_3, g_4)(\Omega^2)}. \tag{5.5}$$

The equation

$$(f_1(w), f_2(w), f_3(w), f_4(w)) = (g_1(z), g_2(z), g_3(z), g_4(z))$$

is called *compatible* if (5.5) holds. If the only possible compatible equations are

$$(\Phi(w_1, w_2), \Psi(w_3, w_4)) = (\Phi(z_1, z_2), \Psi(z_3, z_4)),$$

and

$$(\Phi(w_1, w_2), \Psi(w_3, w_4)) = (\Psi(z_3, z_4), \Phi(z_1, z_2)),$$

then we call $\Upsilon_{\Phi,\Psi}$ *has no nontrivial compatible equations.*

By the above analysis, we have the following result, which tells us that in some cases (5.3) and (5.4) exhaust all admissible local inverse of $\Upsilon_{\Phi,\Psi}$ on Ω^2.

Theorem 5.2. *Suppose Φ and Ψ are two holomorphic proper maps over Ω such that $\Phi(\Omega) = \Psi(\Omega)$, and both maps are holomorphic on $\overline{\Omega}$. Assume that $\Upsilon_{\Phi,\Psi}$ has no nontrivial compatible equation. Then $\mathcal{V}^*(\Upsilon_{\Phi,\Psi}, \Omega^2)$ is generated by $\mathcal{E}_{[\rho]}$, where ρ is of the form (5.3) or (5.4).*

Under conditions in Theorem 5.2, $\mathcal{V}^*(\Upsilon_{\Phi,\Psi}, \Omega^2)$ is trivial if and only if $\Phi = \Psi$ and Φ is biholomorphic.

Corollary 5.3. *Under the conditions in Theorem 5.2, $\mathcal{V}^*(\Upsilon_{\Phi,\Psi}, \Omega^2)$ is not $*$-isomorphic to $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \Omega) \otimes \mathcal{V}^*(\Psi, \Omega)$.*

Usually $\Upsilon_{\Phi,\Psi}$ has no nontrivial compatible equation. The following provides such an example.

Example 5.4. *Let $\Omega = \mathbb{D}^2$, and define*

$$\Phi(z_1, z_2) = (z_1^2 + z_2^3, z_1^2 z_2^3),\ (z_1, z_2) \in \Omega,$$

and

$$\Psi(z_1, z_2) = (z_1 + z_2, z_1 z_2),\ (z_1, z_2) \in \Omega.$$

It is clear that $\Phi(\Omega) = \Psi(\Omega)$.

First, we state that there is no nontrivial compatable equations for $\Upsilon_{\Phi,\Psi}$. For this, consider

$$\begin{cases} w_1^2 + w_2^3 = z_1^2 + z_2^3, \\ w_1^2 w_2^3 = z_3 z_4, \\ w_3 + w_4 = z_3 + z_4, \\ w_3 w_4 = z_1^2 z_2^3. \end{cases}$$

Define $\pi_1(z) = z_1$, $\pi_{1,2}(z) = (z_1, z_2)$ for $z \in \mathbb{C}^4$, and etc. By (5.5) we have

$$\pi_1\overline{(f_1, f_2, f_3, f_4)(\Omega^2)} = \pi_1\overline{(g_1, g_2, g_3, g_4)(\Omega^2)},$$

$$\pi_{1,2}\overline{(f_1, f_2, f_3, f_4)(\Omega^2)} = \pi_{1,2}\overline{(g_1, g_2, g_3, g_4)(\Omega^2)}, \tag{5.6}$$

and so on. By (5.6) we would have

$$\overline{\{(w_1^2 + w_2^3, w_1^2 w_2^3) : w_1, w_2 \in \mathbb{D}\}} = 2\overline{\mathbb{D}} \times \overline{\mathbb{D}},$$

but this is impossible. Similarly, any equations of the form

$$\begin{cases} w_1^2 + w_2^3 = z_3 + z_4, \\ w_1^2 w_2^3 = z_1^2 z_2^3, \\ \cdots, \\ \cdots \end{cases}$$

is not compatible. The remaining cases can be handled in a similar way. Thus, there is no nontrivial compatable equations for $\Upsilon_{\Phi,\Psi}$.

As follows, we will determine all admissible local inverses of $\Upsilon_{\Phi,\Psi}$. For this, it suffices to consider compatible equations. First write

$$\begin{cases} w_1^2 + w_2^3 = z_1^2 + z_2^3, \\ w_1^2 w_2^3 = z_1^2 z_2^3, \\ w_3 + w_4 = z_3 + z_4, \\ w_3 w_4 = z_3 z_4. \end{cases}$$

The corresponding local inverse is

$$(\rho(z_1, z_2), \sigma(z_3, z_4)),$$

where ρ has the form

$$(\sqrt{z_2^3}, \sqrt[3]{z_1^2}) \quad \text{or} \quad (\omega_1 z_1, \omega_2 z_2), \quad \text{with} \quad \omega_1^2 = \omega_2^3 = 1,$$

and

$$\sigma(z_3, z_4) = (z_3, z_4) \quad \text{or} \quad \sigma(z_3, z_4) = (z_4, z_3).$$

It remains to deal with the equations

$$\begin{cases} w_1^2 + w_2^3 = z_3 + z_4, \\ w_1^2 w_2^3 = z_3 z_4, \\ w_3 + w_4 = z_1^2 + z_2^3, \\ w_3 w_4 = z_1^2 z_2^3. \end{cases}$$

Then we get the local inverses

$$(\sqrt{z_3}, \sqrt[3]{z_4}, z_1^2, z_2^3), (\sqrt{z_3}, \sqrt[3]{z_4}, z_2^3, z_1^2)$$

and

$$(\sqrt[3]{z_4}, \sqrt{z_3}, z_1^2, z_2^3), (\sqrt[3]{z_4}, \sqrt{z_3}, z_2^3, z_1^2).$$

All the above local inverses are admissible. This shows that $\mathcal{V}^*(\Upsilon_{\Phi,\Psi}, \Omega^2)$ has rich structures.

Compared with Theorem 5.2, Theorem 1.4 is of special interest. We now comes to its proof.

Proof of Theorem 1.4. Suppose Φ and Ψ are two holomorphic proper maps over Ω and both maps are holomorphic on $\overline{\Omega}$. We must determine all admissible local inverses of $\Upsilon_{\Phi,\Psi}$. Since $\Upsilon_{\Phi,\Psi}$ has no nontrivial compatible equation. It reduces to two cases of (5.2):

$$(\Phi(w_1, w_2), \Psi(w_3, w_4)) = (\Phi(z_1, z_2), \Psi(z_3, z_4)) \tag{5.7}$$

and

$$(\Phi(w_1, w_2), \Psi(w_3, w_4)) = (\Psi(z_3, z_4), \Phi(z_1, z_2)) \tag{5.8}$$

If there were an admissible local solution for (5.8), then by Remark 3.5 and (3.4)

$$\overline{\Phi(\Omega) \times \Psi(\Omega)} = \overline{\Psi(\Omega) \times \Phi(\Omega)},$$

forcing $\overline{\Phi(\Omega)} = \overline{\Psi(\Omega)}$. This is a contradiction. Therefore, there is no admissible local solution for (5.8).

It remains to deal with (5.7). It is clear that each admissible local solution η of (5.7) is exactly of the form $(\rho(z_1, z_2), \sigma(z_3, z_4))$, where ρ and σ are

admissible local inverses of Φ and Ψ in Ω, respectively. Since Φ is a holomorphic proper maps over Ω, all of its local inverses are admissible. Theorem 2.5 shows that $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \Omega)$ is generated by $\mathcal{E}_\rho$, where ρ run over all admissible local inverses of Φ. The same is true for $\mathcal{V}^*(\Psi, \Omega)$. Then by setting

$$\mathcal{E}_{[\rho(z_1,z_2),\sigma(z_3,z_4)]} \mapsto \mathcal{E}_{[\rho]} \otimes \mathcal{E}_{[\sigma]},$$

we obtain a $*$-isomorphism between $\mathcal{V}^*(\Upsilon_{\Phi,\Psi}, \Omega^2)$ and $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \Omega) \otimes \mathcal{V}^*(\Psi, \Omega)$, finishing the proof of Theorem 1.4. □

Both Theorems 5.2 and 1.4 have natural generalizations to the case of Ω being a bounded domain in $\mathbb{C}^d$. The proofs are just the same. Also, one can define a map like $\Upsilon_{\Phi,\Psi}$ based on three or more holomorphic proper maps on Ω, and there is no essential difference.

Proposition 1.3 follows essentially from Theorem 1.4 and its proof is presented as below.

Proof of Proposition 1.3. Suppose f and g are holomorphic over $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$. Following the proof of Theorem 1.4, one obtains a $*$-isomorphism between $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi_{f,g}, \mathbb{D}^2)$ and $\mathcal{V}^*(f, \mathbb{D}) \otimes \mathcal{V}^*(g, \mathbb{D})$.

Since f is holomorphic over $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$, by Thomson's theorem [T1] there is a finite Blaschke product B_f such that

$$\mathcal{V}^*(f, \mathbb{D}) = \mathcal{V}^*(B_f, \mathbb{D}).$$

Recall that for each finite Blaschke product B, $\mathcal{V}^*(B, \mathbb{D})$ is abelian [DPW, Theorem 1.1]. Then so is $\mathcal{V}^*(f, \mathbb{D})$, as well as $\mathcal{V}^*(g, \mathbb{D})$. Therefore, the von Neumann algebra $\mathcal{V}^*(f, \mathbb{D}) \otimes \mathcal{V}^*(g, \mathbb{D})$ is abelian, and hence $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi_{f,g}, \mathbb{D}^2)$ is abelian. □

To end this section, we construct an example which essentially arises from elementary symmetric polynomials.

Example 5.5. *Suppose Ω is a domain in $\mathbb{C}^d$. Recall that the complete homogeneous symmetric polynomial h_k of degree k in d variables $z_1, \cdots, z_d$, is the sum of all monomials of total degree k in the variables. Precisely,*

$$h_k(z) = \sum_{1 \le j_1 \le j_2 \le \cdots \le j_k \le d} z_{j_1} \cdots z_{j_k}.$$

Write

$$\Phi_I(z) = (z_1 + \cdots + z_d, \sum_{j<k} z_j z_k, \cdots, \Pi_{j=1}^d z_j),$$

$$\Phi_{II}(z) = (z_1 + \cdots + z_d, \sum_{j=1}^{d} z_j^2, \cdots, \sum_{j=1}^{d} z_j^d),$$

and

$$\Phi_{III}(z) = (h_1(z), h_2(z), \cdots, h_d(z)).$$

Note that both Φ_I and Φ_{II} contain elementary symmetric polynomials. There are a polynomial p and q such that

$$\Phi_I = p \circ \Phi_{II} \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi_{II} = q \circ \Phi_I.$$

Thus, M_{Φ_I} and $M_{\Phi_{II}}$ have the same joint reducing subspaces, and then

$$\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi_I, \Omega) = \mathcal{V}^*(\Phi_{II}, \Omega).$$

Since every symmetric polynomial can be expressed as a polynomial expression in $h_1, \cdots, h_d$, by same reasoning we get

$$\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi_I, \Omega) = \mathcal{V}^*(\Phi_{III}, \Omega).$$

Furthermore, if Ω is invariant under S_d, the permutation group, then by the comments below [HZ, Proposition 6.6] we have $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi_I, \Omega) \cong \mathcal{L}(S_d)$. For example, put $\Omega = \mathbb{D}^d$ or $\mathbb{B}_d$. In particular, we have

$$\mathcal{V}^*(z_1 + z_2, z_1 z_2, \mathbb{D}^2) = \mathcal{V}^*(z_1 + z_2, z_1^2 + z_2^2, \mathbb{D}^2) \cong \mathcal{L}(S_2).$$

By same reasoning in Example 5.5, we get the following.

Proposition 5.6. *Suppose $H : \Omega \to \mathbb{C}^d$ is a bounded holomorphic function. Then*

$$\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi_I \circ H, \Omega) = \mathcal{V}^*(\Phi_{II} \circ H, \Omega) = \mathcal{V}^*(\Phi_{III} \circ H, \Omega).$$

In defining the map Υ, we have made use of the map Φ_{II}. Proposition 5.6 shows that in our theorems and propositions, one can just replace Φ_{II} with Φ_I or Φ_{III} without changing anything.

References

[Ch] E. Chirka, *Complex analytic sets*, Mathematics and its Applications (Soviet Series), **46**, Kluwer Academic Publishers Group, Dordrecht, 1989.

[Cow1] C. Cowen, *The commutant of an analytic Toeplitz operator*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **239**(1978), 1-31.

[Cow2] C. Cowen, *The commutant of an analytic Toeplitz operator, II*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **29**(1980), 1-12.

[Cow3] C. Cowen, *An analytic Toeplitz operator that commutes with a compact operator and a related class of Toeplitz operators*, J. Funct. Anal. **36**(1980), 169-184.

[CW] C. Cowen and R. Wahl, *Commutants of finite Blaschke product multiplication operators*, preprint.

[Da] K. Davidson, *C*-algebras by example*, Fields Institute Monographs, **6**, AMS, Rhode Island, 1996.

[DH] H. Dan and H. Huang, *Multiplication operators defined by a class of polynomials on* $L^2_a(\mathbb{D}^2)$, Integr. Equ. Oper. Theory, **80**(2014), 581-601, arXiv: math.OA/1404.5414v1.

[DPW] R. Douglas, M. Putinar and K. Wang, *Reducing subspaces for analytic multipliers of the Bergman space*, J. Funct. Anal. **263**(2012), 1744-1765, arXiv: math.FA/1110.4920v1.

[DSZ] R. Douglas, S. Sun and D. Zheng, *Multiplication operators on the Bergman space via analytic continuation*, Adv. Math. **226**(2011), 541-583.

[GH1] K. Guo and H. Huang, *On multiplication operators of the Bergman space: Similarity, unitary equivalence and reducing subspaces*, J. Operator Theory, **65**(2011), 355-378.

[GH2] K. Guo and H. Huang, *Multiplication operators defined by covering maps on the Bergman space: the connection between operator theory and von Neumann algebras*, J. Funct. Anal. **260**(2011), 1219-1255.

[GH3] K. Guo and H. Huang, *Geometric constructions of thin Blaschke products and reducing subspace problem*, Proc. London Math. Soc. **109**(2014), 1050-1091.

[GH4] K. Guo and H. Huang, *Multiplication operators on the Bergman space*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics **2145**, Springer, Heidelberg, 2015.

[GSZZ] K. Guo, S. Sun, D. Zheng and C. Zhong, *Multiplication operators on the Bergman space via the Hardy space of the bidisk*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **629**(2009), 129-168.

[GW] K. Guo and X. Wang , *Reducing subspaces of tensor products of weighted shifts*, Sci. China Ser. A. **59**(2016), 715-730.

[HZ] H. Huang and D. Zheng, *Multiplication operators on the Bergman space of bounded domains in* $\mathbb{C}^d$, arXiv: math.OA/ 1511.01678v1.

[LZ] Y. Lu and X. Zhou, *Invariant subspaces and reducing subspaces of weighted Bergman space over bidisk*, J. Math. Soc. Japan, 62(2010), 745-765.

[Ma] C. MacDuffee, *The theory of matrices*, Berlin, Springer, 2nd, 1946.

[Re1] R. Remmert, *Projektionen analytischer Mengen*, Math. Ann. **130**(1956), 410-441.

[Re2] R. Remmert, *Holomorphe und meromorphe Abbildungen komplexer Räume* Math. Ann. **133**(1957), 328-370.

[Ru1] W. Rudin, *Function theory in polydiscs*, Benjamin, New York, 1969.

[Ru2] W. Rudin, *Function theory in the unit ball of* $\mathbb{C}^n$, Grundlehren der Math. **241**, Springer, New York, 1980.

[Ru3] W. Rudin, *Real and complex analysis*, 3rd edition, McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York, 1987.

[SZZ] S. Sun, D. Zheng and C. Zhong, *Classification of reducing subspaces of a class of multiplication operators via the Hardy space of the bidisk*, Canad. J. Math. **62**(2010), 415-438.

[SL] Y. Shi and Y. Lu, *Reducing subspaces for Toeplitz operators on the polydisk*, Bull. Korean Math. Soc. **50**(2013), 687-696.

[T1] J. Thomson, *The commutant of a class of analytic Toeplitz operators*, Amer. J. Math. **99**(1977), 522-529.

[T2] J. Thomson, *The commutant of a class of analytic Toeplitz operators II*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **25**(1976), 793-800.

[Ti] A. Tikaradze, *Multiplication operators on the Bergman spaces of pseudo-convex domains*, New York J. Math. **21**(2015), 1327-1345.

[WDH] X. Wang, H. Dan and H. Huang, *Reducing subspaces of multiplication operators with the symbol* $\alpha z^k + \beta w^l$ *on* $L^2_a(\mathbb{D}^2)$, Sci. China Ser. A. **58**(2015), doi: 10.1007/s11425-015-4973-9

Center of Mathematics, Chongqing University, Chongqing, 401331, China, E-mail: chongqingmath@gmail.com
Department of Mathematics, East China University of Science and Technology, Shanghai, 200237, China, E-mail: hshuang@ecust.edu.cn